Most programs are funded from two or more sources, making the responsibility for program support more equitable and less burdensome than if one entity alone had to pay the entire cost. This chapter discusses the shared funding arrangements of several of the programs in the study and then describes innovative funding approaches several programs have discovered. The following chapter, "Maintaining Program Funding," discusses how programs have gone about motivating potential funding sources to contribute money—or to maintain or increase the amount of money they were already contributing to the program.

Who Pays for the Program

Whether program costs are shared among two or more entities does not appear to depend on how much the program costs. Some of the least expensive programs have been funded from multiple sources, while some costly programs have only a single funding source.

Develop a Realistic Estimate of Program Costs

Whether a single entity pays the entire program's costs or the expenses are shared among different groups, agencies need to get a good grasp on how much their programs actually cost. This is not as simple as it sounds. Obviously, program costs vary according to the number of SROs in the program. However, *other factors make it difficult to calculate program costs or to compare costs among programs*.

- Starting salaries, as well as average salaries, for police officers and sheriff's deputies vary widely among jurisdictions. Fringe benefits also vary significantly. Taken together, these differences can result in one program's costs being double those of another program even with a similar number of SROs.

- SRO salaries also vary among programs depending on the officers' length of employment with the department: SROs who have been with the agency for many years have higher salaries than do new recruits. Furthermore, in some programs the SRO position is considered a specialty assignment that requires a salary increment, or the agency voluntarily provides SROs with a salary stipend (see the discussion of "Providing Incentives" in chapter 2, "Recruiting SROs"). When combined with differences in salaries and fringe benefits, the cost per SRO may be under $45,000 or over $100,000.

- Program costs also vary among sites depending on whether the salaries of supervisory and support staff are included in the budget. Some supervisors devote only a small percentage of their time to the program, but others spend full time on it. A program's purported budget may not take account of the proportion of these supervisors' salaries that reflects the time they spend on the program.

- Training, overtime pay, equipment, and other miscellaneous costs are not calculated in determining some programs' total costs. Some of these expenses also represent one-time costs that need to be "amortized" over several years-for example, cruisers.

As a result of these considerations, the program's budget in Terrebone Parish, Louisiana, is $280,000 for 9 SROs, but in Fontana, California, the budget is over $969,000 for only 8 SROs. Similarly, program costs in Pasquotank County, North Carolina, are $175,000 for 4 SROs but almost $4,000 more ($178,834) in Boone, North Carolina, for only 3 SROs. The box "Costs, Sources of Funding, and Personnel for Selected Programs" presents the budgets of selected programs included in the study to further illustrate the difficulty predicting—and comparing—program costs.

Explore Options for Sharing Program Costs

In some jurisdictions, a single source provides the program's entire funding. However, ***increasingly funding sources—whether law enforcement agencies or school districts—that were previously providing all the money have been insisting that other groups share the costs*** (see chapter 8, "Maintaining Program Funding"). In fact, as illustrated in the box below, funding arrangements among the programs studied are a patchwork quilt of different configurations.

Most commonly, program costs are shared between the law enforcement agency and the school district. However, while it may appear that a police agency or school district is contributing some or all a program's funding, ***the money may in fact come from one or more other sources***. For example, the law enforcement agency's or school district's contribution may represent a supplement provided by the county or municipality to augment the agency's standard operating budget.

- The Boone, North Carolina, Police Department is reimbursed for its single SRO by the school district, which, in turn, receives the money from the State.

- In Virginia Beach, Virginia, the city council adds the cost of the 30 SROs' salaries and equipment to the police department's annual budget to support the program.

In some communities, several school districts contribute money to the program because, when the law enforcement agency's jurisdiction includes more than one school district, SROs serve the schools in these multiple school districts.

The Delaware State Police and the King County, Washington, Sheriff's Office, provide SROs to interested school districts or local governments through somewhat different cost-sharing arrangements as described in the box "Samples of Cost Sharing Arrangements."

Costs, Sources of Funding, and Personnel for Selected Programs			
Program Sponsor	**Total Annual Cost in Recent Years**	**Funding Source(s)**	**Funded Full-Time Personnel**
Terrebone Parish, Louisiana, Sheriff's Office	$280,000	Sheriff's Office: $80,000 School District: $200,000	9 SROs
Tucson, Arizona, Police Department	$2,141,050	Police Department: $2,000,000	23 SROs 3 supervisors 1 secretary
Stark County, Ohio, Sheriff's Office	$200,000	Federal Government: $200,000	5 SROs
Sarasota County, Florida, Sheriff's Office	$2,413,426	Sheriff's Office: $1,239,713 School District: $1,173, 713	27 SROs 3 supervisors 1 office manager 2 SROs
Salem, New Hampshire, Police Department	$100,000	Police Department: $100,000	
Marshall, Minnesota, Police Department	$80,000	Federal Government: $40,000 Police Department: 26,000 School District: $14,000	1 SRO
Fontana, California, Police Department	$949,600	Federal Government: $252,000 Police Department: $507,200 School District: $190,400 Private Sources: $20,000 (provided over a period of several years)	8 SROs
Lakewood, Colorado, Police Department	$694,982	Police Department: $694,982	7 SROs 1 sergeant 1 secretary
Pasquotank, North Carolina, Sheriff's Office	$175,000 $46,927	Sheriff's Office: $78,000 School District: $97,000	4 SROs
Boone, North Carolina, Police Department	$2 million	School District: $46,927	1 SRO
Delaware State Police		State Police: $1 million School Districts: $1 million	25 SROs

Samples of Cost Sharing Arrangements

Two law enforcement agencies charge school districts or local governments a fee for each SRO the programs provide. The fee established by the Delaware State Police covers only half the cost of the service, while in most cases the fee the King County, Washington, Sheriff's Office charges covers the entire cost of the service.

Delaware State Police Program

The Delaware State Police serves all counties in the State. Interested school districts submit a formal request for a specific number of SROs, agreeing to pay the salary of a newly hired state trooper—$48,724—for each SRO requested.

The school district must specify how it intends to pay for the SROs. If it plans to use grant funding, it must specify the length of the grant and any requirement that the SRO be retained after grant funding ends. The State Police reviews this information carefully to ensure that it will not be responsible for paying the officer's full salary after the grant has ended.

If the funding sources are sound, the department then considers its current and authorized strength levels—that is, the number of sworn officers employed versus the number of positions authorized by the State legislature—to determine whether it has enough vacancies to meet the school district's request. If not, the department asks the legislature to authorize additional positions in the State Police budget to support the request.

The department must also request additional funds from the State legislature before it can meet a school district's request for an SRO or another SRO, because the agency places a seasoned—and relatively expensive—officer with at least five years' experience in the school as the SRO but is reimbursed by the school district for the entry-level salary of the new recruit the department uses to replace the SRO. As a result, the police department contributes the approximately $40,000 difference between the two salaries, including the new SRO's training and equipment costs. The State Police estimates that, as a result, it pays for half each new SRO's actual total costs.

King County, Washington, Sheriff's Office Program

No SRO program funding comes from the King County Sheriff's Office general budget. While in the past Federal funds have been a major source of program support, the program currently receives no Federal funding either. Instead, each interested incorporated city within the county, in partnership with its school district, pays the sheriff's office $121,641 for each full-time SRO the jurisdiction wants to "hire." The annual fee includes the cost of the SRO's salary ($57,730) and fringe benefits ($20,477), anticipated overtime ($4,524), vehicle and operating costs ($8,331), department administrative charges ($8,602), precinct support staff ($2,855), and other expenses. The program requires unincorporated areas to reimburse the sheriff's office only about one-third of the total cost of each SRO with the understanding that the department will assign the officer to regular patrol or other duties during the summer months.

A few law enforcement agencies pay the entire cost of the program **by choice** because they believe they might lose complete control of its operations if the school district contributed some of the costs.

- When one SRO program began, the deputy chief of the police department did not ask the school district to contribute to the program. He maintained this stance even after the department's budget was cut by over $1 million and he had to return the SROs to patrol, because he did not want to give up control over the officers to the schools—"they would dictate when the SROs should make arrests."

- The SRO supervisor and an assistant chief in another jurisdiction rejected the idea of asking the school district to contribute funding to the program because "We lose control. They will call and ask you to do things that you can't then refuse to do." Even when its COPS in Schools grants expired, the police department picked up the entire cost of the program.

While another law enforcement agency bills each participating school district monthly for 75 percent of the cost of each SRO, the agency deliberately pays 25 percent of the officer's cost itself to be able to have some control over the officers. For example, the program supervisor feels he has the right to reassign the officers to patrol on days when school is called off because of snow storms, in-service faculty training, or other reasons.

When law enforcement agencies and school districts share program costs, the two entities negotiate each party's share, with some costs sometimes paid for by still other sources.

- In Terrebone Parish, the school district pays half the salaries of five SROs and the entire salaries of four SROs. The sheriff's office pays the other half of the five SROs' salaries. Since in 2001 an SRO's annual salary was about $30,000, the school district's contribution was about $200,000 and the sheriff's department's contribution about $80,000.

- In Chula Vista, California, the police department and secondary school district split the cost of 12 of the current 18 SROs and one field agent, with each entity in 2004 contributing $545,912. The elementary school district pays 40 percent of the cost of the remaining 6 SROs and one field agent—$300,671—while the police department pays the remaining 60 percent—$439,916. The program costs are supplemented by a $246,410 COPS in Schools grant.

- The Fontana program's eight SROs are supported by a combination of police department ($507,000), school district ($190,400), and Federal funds ($252,000). Some of the positions are paid for entirely by the police department, others are split between the police department and two school districts, and one is funded

entirely by a third school district. Throughout the program's history, several SRO positions have been funded with COPS in Schools grants. The program has secured private sector contributions of over $20,000 (see the case study at the end of the chapter).

• Schools in some jurisdictions do not share in the program costs at all. The Garner, North Carolina, Police Department has three SROs. Each year, the town supports the full cost of one SRO's salary and equipment, with the State reimbursing the town for approximately 75 percent of his salary and equipment costs ($37,838) and the county reimbursing approximately 25 percent of his salary and equipment ($18,919). The town of Garner pays the entire cost of the other two SROs ($121,477).

In several programs, because both parties recognize that the SROs will not be working at the schools year-round, the school district covers their salaries only for the months that school is in session. For example, in Schaumberg, Illinois, the school district used to pay only three-quarters of the SROs' salaries because the SROs return to their regular juvenile officer duties during the summer.

The ostensible sharing of program costs between a law enforcement agency and a school district may be misleading because the school district is reimbursing only salaries, but the actual cost of the program to the department includes equipment and training. In other cases, as in Delaware, the school district reimburses the department the cost of an officer's base or entry-level salary but, because the SROs are seasoned—and, therefore, higher-paid—officers, the department ends up paying the balance.

Some school districts pay part or all of the SROs' overtime.

• In Terrebone Parish, because school sports have to pay for themselves through fund raising, some of these funds are used to pay the SROs' overtime to supervise these events. For non-sport related assignments, the school district uses its activity fund to pay SROs $11 an hour overtime.

• In Palm Beach County, Florida, if a school function or sports event charges an admission fee, the school has to pay for the SROs' overtime.

In a few cases, jurisdictions have built a mechanism into their memorandums of agreement or contracts for automatic modifications of each contributor's share of program costs (see the box "The Scottsdale Police Department's Automatic Cost Shifting"). In Marshall, Minnesota, as the COPS in Schools grant decreased each year from 75 percent to 60 percent to 55 percent of the program's costs, the school district's and city's share increased correspondingly from 8 to 14 percent for the school district and from 17 to 30 percent for the city.

The Scottsdale Police Department's Automatic Cost Shifting
The 14 Scottsdale, Arizona, Police Department SROs provide services to two different school districts. The department established an Intergovernmental Agreement with one school district to cooperatively cover the costs for 10 SROs and another agreement with the second school district to cooperatively cover the costs for 3 SROs. Both agreements include graduated payment plans that over time increase the school districts' share of the SROs' salaries, based on an average officer's salary. For example, one of the agreements began with the school district reimbursing 60 percent of an SRO's base salary; by 2003, the district was expected to cover 70 percent of the cost; and the goal is for the district to pay for 80 percent of the cost by 2006.

When not provided for in the initial memorandum of understanding or contract, shifting costs is typically an arduous, drawn-out, and sometimes acrimonious undertaking. For example, while for the most part ultimately successful, programs in Stark County and Schaumburg experienced severe difficulties agreeing on the proportion of program funding each involved entity would contribute (see the case studies at the end of chapter 8, "Maintaining Program Funding").

How to Find the Money

COPS in Schools grants have been the sole or partial funding source for more than 6,567 SROs. However, when the three-year grants end, the law enforcement agency either has to pick up the cost of the program or ask local school districts or government agencies to pay for a share, or a larger share, of the expense. In addition, when many law enforcement agencies—and their participating school districts—included in the study suffered severe budgets cutbacks in the early 2000s, they tried—often successfully—to find additional funds from their own budgets, tap into nontraditional sources of funding, or shift some of the costs to their partnering agencies and to local government. The discussion below, summarized in the box "Finding Innovative Ways to Help Pay for the Program," identifies the creative ways these programs have been able to find money.

Finding Innovative Ways to Help Pay for the Program		
Law Enforcement Agencies	**School Districts and Schools**	**Local Governments**
• explore nontraditional Federal sources of funding* • cut back and transfer funds from D.A.R.E. • secure business contributions • apply for foundation grants • solicit funds from charities and fraternal organizations • host fundraisers • find free or low-cost sources of training (see chapter 5) • certify an SRO as a trainer (see chapter 5) • train other agencies' SROs for a fee	• use athletic event fees • increase fees for parking lot passes or extracurricular activities • host fund raisers • reallocate 1% from other budget line items—e.g., technology, supplies, sports, capital expenditures • apply for foundation grants • solicit funds from charities and fraternal organizations	• reallocate 1% from other budget line items—e.g., recreation, highway department, libraries, public works • merge two departments (e.g., public works and highways) into one to save money • cut back on hiring plans • apply for foundation grants • solicit funds from charities and fraternal organizations
* As explained in the text, programs have obtained money from the U.S. Department of Education's Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program and the U.S. Department of Justice's Byrne Formula Grant Program and Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants.		

See If the School District Can Contribute Additional Funding

Much of this chapter has already illustrated how law enforcement agencies have been able to arrange for local school districts to provide funding or increase their funding for the program. Below are two additional examples:

• Although the Marshall Police Department began funding the SRO program using a COPS in Schools grant, Robert Yant, the chief of police, told the school district when he applied for the grant that he expected it to pick up more of the cost when the grant ran out. While the share of the cost the school district contributed during the three-year grant period ($1,637, $5,384, and $6,511) was small, Yant "wanted school buy-in and to get it used to contributing to the cost." Before the grant expired, he asked the school district to increase its share of the cost to 50 percent after it ran out. According to Yant, "the program would have been dropped [if the school district had not agreed]. It's partly a philosophical issue—if the school district doesn't feel it's important enough to pay, then it's not important enough for the police department to fund it." The school district agreed to pay half the costs.

• The Stark County Sheriff's Office had been experiencing budget cutbacks since 2002, resulting in the layoff of 60 correctional officers and road deputies that year. While they were all called back in 2003, only 40 returned. As a result, the sheriff told the participating school districts that he would have to recall the SROs unless the school districts agreed to pay for most of the officers' salaries. Four of the five school districts came up with the funds (see the case study at the end of chapter 8, "Maintaining Program Funding").

Some school districts, after the local law enforcement agency pulled out its SROs from the schools because of budget cutbacks, have on their own requested the officers be returned—and found a way to pay for them. The superintendent of schools in one community said, "When the grant ran out, we tried to go it on the cheap—without an SRO—but in three weeks all heck broke loose. So we cut each school line item budget by 1-2 percent—football and basketball, classroom supplies, technology—to come up with the $30,000 to pay for the officer to come back." A high school in King County found some of the money needed to retain its SRO by adding a surcharge to the fees it charges for parking lot passes. The school district executive director provided the additional money from its parking lot supervisor fund since "the SRO does some lot supervision."

Sometimes Adequately Funded Programs Seek Additional Money to Expand
Some programs have secured additional funding from other sources to increase their number of SROs, not because of budget cutbacks. In Terrebone Parish, the sheriff's department initially paid for the SROs. However, the sheriff eventually told the superintendent of schools that he needed help financing the program if it was to expand, and the superintendent requested additional money from the school board. The board unanimously approved the funds. As a result, the school district pays half the salaries for five SROs and the entire salaries for four SROs.

See If Local Government Can Provide (or Increase) Support

Some local governments have increased their funding for their programs—or provided funding for the first time.

- Captain Mike Rogers of the West Orange Police Department asked the city council for increased funding for the program, recognizing that the town had to cut recreation and library expenses, as well as public works, to support increases to the police department's budget. Despite these sacrifices, the council approved the increase in funding.

- All 30 of the Virginia Beach Police Department SRO positions started out as grant-funded positions. At the conclusion of the grants, the police chief and school superintendent made a presentation to the city council to pick up the funding. Because the program had become so popular, council members agreed to pay for the entire program.

Examine Possible Funding From Federal Government Sources

The ***Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS Office)***, part of the U.S. Department of Justice, has provided three-year grants to over 3,000 law enforcement agencies to cover entry-level salaries for SROs. The so-called COPS in Schools grant program provides up to $125,000 per SRO. Agencies must commit to continuing the grant-funded SROs for a fourth year without COPS Office funding. Information about the grant program may be found at: www.cops.usdoj.gov.

A 2002 National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) survey (available at Resourcer@aol.com or 888-31-NASRO) found that "Almost two-thirds (65%) of SROs were unaware that U.S. Department of Education Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program funds can be used to pay for SRO training . . . ." Under Title IV of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act formula grants (Public Law 107-110), each school district receives a sum of money based on student enrollment and other factors. The act expressly allows school districts to spend up to 40 percent of their Title IV money to train and hire school security personnel (see www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/progsum/sum_pg9.html).

Three programs in the present study have obtained Safe and Drug-Free Schools grants for their SRO programs.

• The Virginia Beach Police Department receives a $10,000 reimbursement from the school district through its Safe and Drug-Free Schools grant to cover the time SROs spend teaching either of two safety courses—Aggressors, Victims, and Bystanders, or Options, Choices, and Consequences.

• The Maury County, Tennessee, Sheriff's Department covers some of its training costs using school district Safe and Drug-Free Schools grant funds.

• Several school districts in King County, Washington, use Title IV funds to reimburse the Sheriff's Office for providing SROs to their schools (see the box above, "Two Programs Have Established Cost Sharing Arrangements").

The ***Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Program*** (Byrne Formula Grant Program), funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, provides funding to States and units of local government to support personnel, equipment, training, technical assistance, and information systems to improve the criminal justice response to violent and serious crimes. Maury County funded 75 percent of two SRO's salaries for three years with Byrne grants. See www.ojp.usdoj.gov or call (800) 421-6770.

The Tucson, Arizona, Police Department has made use of $1,802,757 in **Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants** from U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to establish and maintain accountability and prevention programs, and to provide overtime for SROs to participate in activities that involve interacting with students after hours. See www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org or call (800) 638-8736.

Be Creative in Seeking Funding Sources

Several programs have obtained funds from businesses, charities, and foundations, and by hosting fund-raising events.

• A January 6, 2004, Lansing State Journal article, "Mason [Michigan] schools regain resource officer," written by Trout Sally, reported that when a COPS in School grant ran out in the middle of the 2003-2004 school year, city officials agreed to pay $23,000 of the SRO's $35,000 cost if the school district paid $12,000—about one-third the cost. Because the school district reported it did not have the money, a former president of the Kiwanis Club of Mason initiated a Kiwanis fundraiser to find the money so the officer could finish out the school year. The club raised $4,500, mostly from local businesses, which was supplemented by a United Way contribution of $3,500 and a contribution from the American Legion.

• After the Columbine tragedy, Jim Marshall, the SRO in Marshall, Minnesota, asked his supervisor to host an active shooter course for him and the patrol officers. Because paying for the course would have been too expensive, Marshall suggested the supervisor talk with someone at the alternative school who, he knew, had grant money for violence prevention in the schools. The supervisor met with the person, who agreed to contribute $2,500 for a trainer to come to Marshall to offer the course; the police department had to contribute only $500.

• The Maury County Sheriff's Department has raised funds through a nonprofit entity the department created in 1999 called the Fraternal Order of Police Club. The club hosted a rodeo to raise money for the SRO and Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) programs to pay for training and to purchase educational materials, pencils for students, and other materials the programs needed.

• The Fontana Police Department developed its own in-house basic SRO training course (see the case study at the end of chapter 5, "Training SROs"), arranged for the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training to certify it, and then offered the training to other law enforcement agencies, charging a $175 registration fee per participating SRO. After deducting expenses, the department made almost $2,000 on the class. It used the money to buy new equipment for a program its SROs conduct in the elementary schools.

Some Agencies Have Cut D.A.R.E. to Protect Their SRO Programs
A few law enforcement agencies in the study, when forced to make cuts, have put their Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) officers back on patrol in order to retain their SROs in the schools. • When four officers left the Marshall Police Department (one went to the National Guard, two resigned, and one retired), school administrators and police department commanders agreed to return the D.A.R.E officer to patrol duty rather than reassign the SRO. Command staff did not want to lose the SRO because, before he took up his position, patrol officers were constantly being called to the schools to handle problems. • After the 9/11 tragedy, the Sioux Falls, South Dakota, Police Department lost nearly 10 percent of its sworn officers to the military. As a result, department divisions that lost officers sought to make up for their reductions in personnel by asking the chief to transfer personnel from elsewhere in the department to their divisions. In response, the police chief abandoned the D.A.R.E. program, transferring its officers to the depleted divisions in order avoid having to cut back the SRO program. • To be able to continue its SRO program, the Lakewood, Colorado, Police Department, dropped its D.A.R.E. program, using the funding to support its SROs.

Some programs have been especially creative in providing their SROs with free training.

• In Palm Beach County, the school district's police department arranged for trainers from other law enforcement agencies to teach its SROs classes on religious terrorism and biometrics (thumb scans, retinal scanning) at no cost to the department in exchange for the department's having provided their departments with training in such areas as crisis response and by allowing their officers to attend recertification courses along with the Palm Beach County SROs.

• Sergeant Richard Davies, a former SRO in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, on his own initiative and expense took a course with Corbin & Associates to become certified as an SRO trainer. Davies then developed a 40-hour training syllabus, which he taught during the summer to officers who might apply for any SRO positions that might open up the following school year. In the long run, this approach saved the agency money by avoiding the registration fees and travel expenses involved in sending SROs out of town to be trained by professional organizations.

*   *   *

The case studies below describe how the Fontana, California, and Saratoga County, Florida, programs have been especially diligent and innovative in securing funding.

• The Fontana program makes use of various cost-sharing arrangements with the schools and has secured funding from multiple sources, including from the private sector.

• The Saratoga County program has obtained money from foundations and community groups, by sponsoring its own fund-raising events, and from in-kind contributions.

Case Study: Fontana, California, Police Department (151 sworn)

In addition to tapping multiple funding sources, the Fontana Police Department arranges different funding formulas with different school districts.

The Program Developed Different Cost Sharing Arrangements

A combination of police department, school district, and grant funds support eight SROs. The police department funds some of the positions fully, while the costs of other SROs are split between the department and two school districts. A third school district provides all the funds for another SRO. Throughout most of the program's history, at least one SRO position has been funded through COPS in Schools grants. *The department also signed memorandums of agreement with the school districts guaranteeing the required fourth year of local funding for the federally funded positions before submitting the grant applications.*

Because the department's jurisdiction is not contiguous with school district boundaries, it offered to place SROs in all of the middle schools that children who live in the department's jurisdiction might attend, proposing to split the funding of the officer's salary with the school districts. The city (through the police department) offers to pay the same percentage as the percentage of the school population that lives in the city of Fontana.

Program Funding Increased to Support Eight SROs

Starting with a single SRO in 1994, the police department has managed to obtain additional funding to the point where by 2004 the program had eight SROs.

(1)   The SRO program began in 1994 with a grant from the COPS Office *for a single SRO*—not, however, a COPS in Schools grant but a grant for increasing community policing in Fontana. Under the grant, the police department assigned an SRO to extend community policing into schools. In 1997, the city assumed the costs of the program after the COPS Office grant expired.

(2)   In 2000, the city received funding from a COPS in Schools grant to fund *two additional positions*. The needed local matching funds for the grant program were shared by the Fontana Unified School District and the city of Fontana. In addition, the city and the school district signed a contract to share the cost of funding both positions fully for at least one additional year after the grant was over. As a result, these positions have been supported with city and school district funds since the grant expired in 2003.

(3)   In 2002, the police department received a second COPS in Schools grant *for a fourth SRO* to work in a new middle school built in the city of Fontana

but served by the Etiwanda School District. The police department provided the local match.

(4)   ***An additional SRO*** was funded under an agreement with the Colton Unified School District to place an SRO in a middle school outside Fontana. The police department pays 55 percent of the cost of the officer, because that is the percentage of students in the school who live in the city, while the Colton School District pays the other 45 percent, representing the students who live in the unincorporated areas outside the city.

(5)   The Fontana Unified School District Police Department fully funds ***a sixth full-time officer*** who is assigned to work in one of the middle schools.

(6)   In 2002, the police department funded ***two more positions***, bringing the total to eight full time SROs.

Private Funding Supports Several Program Initiatives

The department has secured and continues to seek funding from national and local businesses for special SRO events and activities such as DRY2K (a multimedia alcohol prevention program) and Dream Builders (a mentoring program designed to link at-risk students with professionals in the community). In addition to benefiting from the relatively small but still helpful financial support, program supervisors capitalize on the donations in other ways.

• Program supervisors view these business contributions that support innovative SRO activities as another way to increase the officers' motivation to develop creative solutions to school problems.

• Program supervisors use the recognition for the program provided by the corporate awards to further bolster their case for the program's excellence.

• In turn, the supervisors parlay the program's national reputation for innovation and distinction into helping to maintain funding from the city and the school districts.

The program uses corporate contributions to pay for the cost of programs, and for materials related to programs, but not for SRO salaries. For example, ***about $15,000 has been donated over the years*** to duplicate and buy equipment for the DRY2K program and train other agencies to implement the program. ***Major donors include Microsoft, Toyota Motor Sports, and the Auto Club.*** Fontana SROs have taught the program in all three high schools within the Fontana Unified School District. Corporations also support the Dream Builders program. ***Local businesses contribute about $5,000 per year*** to pay for field trips and other expenses (excluding SRO salaries) related to the initiative.

Case Study: Sarasota County, Florida, Sheriff's Office Program

The Sarasota County program's annual budget of more than $2,400,000 is split almost equally between the sheriff's office and the school district. Nevertheless, despite relatively guaranteed funding (see the Sarasota County case study at the end of chapter 8, "Maintaining Program Funding"), the program leaves no stone unturned in attempting to secure additional funding.

Even though the school district contributes roughly half the program's costs, the program still asked the school board to contribute an additional $10,000 in 2004 for SRO registration fees for training and the associated out-of-state per diem and travel expenses. In addition to providing the funds, the school board agreed to split the $3,015 cost of maintaining a dog for the program.

While each high school and middle school SRO in Sarasota County had an office in his or her school equipped with a computer, elementary school SROs did not have offices—and therefore did not have computers. As a result, *the program asked for— and received—a grant from the Gulf Coast Community Foundation of Venice, the largest community foundation in Florida, for $11,000 to purchase seven laptop computers with extended warrantees*.

Networking sometimes results in funding leads. While attending a meeting of the Association of Communities, Sheriff William Balkwill was told by a community group that it wanted to donate money for the benefit of kids in the county. When he returned to his office, Balkwill passed on the information to Tim Carney, the captain in charge of the SRO program. Carney contacted the group, which ended up making a $1,000 contribution to the program. As word about the donation spread, the Elks decided it would raise money for the program; not to be outdone, the Moose held a dance to raise money.

The sheriff's office itself has held fundraising events to raise money for the program. When he was an SRO, Captain Tim Carney held several golf tournaments, each of which raised about $5,000 for the Youth Services Division, which houses the SRO and D.A.R.E. programs (elementary school SROs are dually trained as D.A.R.E. officers). In 2003, as the division commander, *Carney organized a golf tournament that raised $13,000, which he used to pay the SROs' travel expenses to attend a NASRO training in Orlando, Florida*.

The program has secured *in-kind space from the school district worth tens of thousands of dollars*. The superintendent of schools and sheriff decided together to house the SRO program in the building owned by the school district and used for its headquarters. Because space is tight in the sheriff's office building, the department would have had to rent space and furniture to house the program. However, the school district donated space to the program for free, including a large reception area and two offices.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

This Page Intentionally Left Blank